



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,288	02/06/2006	Mark J. Redmond	2315-127	3148
6449 7590 10/07/2009 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER MACAULEY, SHERIDAN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1651				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/554,288

Applicant(s)

REDMOND ET AL.

Examiner

SHERIDAN R. MACAULEY

Art Unit

1651

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-16 and 28-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-16 and 28-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A response and amendment were received and entered on August 12, 2009. All evidence and arguments have been fully considered. Claims 1-11, 14-16 and 28-34 are pending and examined on the merits in this office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 12, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1651

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 29-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatti (US 5,518,710) in view of Potter et al. (US 6,323,338) and Jamas et al. (US 5,622,939). Claim 1 recites a method of isolating beta (1-3) beta (1-4) glucan (referred to as beta glucan in this office action) from milled cereal grain or a milled part of the cereal grain comprising: (i) extracting the milled cereal grain or the milled part of the cereal grain with an alkaline solution having a pH of between 9 to 10 for a period of time of about 15 to about 45 minutes to produce an extract containing at least about 0.4 weight % beta glucan; (ii) removing insoluble material, and removing particulate material having a particle size of greater than about 0.2 microns from said extract to produce a purified extract comprising beta glucan having a particle size of less than 0.2 microns, wherein the step of removing particulate material comprises filtering out material having a particle size greater than about 0.2 microns from said

extract by microfiltration with a cutoff of 0.2 microns to produce a filtrate comprising beta glucan having a particle size of less than 0.2 microns; (iii) adding from between 10% to 20% (vol/vol) of a C₁-C₄ alcohol to the purified extract to precipitate the beta glucan; and (iv) isolating the beta glucan. Claims 2 and 3 further limit claim 1 by reciting the limitation that the C₁-C₄ alcohol is selected from the group consisting of methanol, ethanol and isopropanol, specifically ethanol. Claim 4 further limits claim 1 by reciting the limitation that the step of removing the particulate material further comprises the following steps prior to the microfiltration step: adding a flocculant, a coagulant of both a flocculant and a coagulant to the extract to coagulate particulate material having a particle size of greater than 0.2 microns and removing coagulated material from said extract; and digesting starch material in said extract. Claim 5 further limits claim 4 by reciting the limitation that the starch material is digested with an enzyme. Claim 6 further limits claim 5 by reciting the limitation that, prior to digestion of starch material, the alkaline solution is neutralized. Claim 9 further limits claim 5 by reciting the limitation that the enzyme is an amylase. Claim 11 further limits claim 1 by reciting that the cereal is selected from the group consisting of a cultivar of barley, a cultivar of oat, a cultivar of wheat, a cultivar of rye, a cultivar of sorghum, a cultivar of millet, and a cultivar of corn. Claim 14 further limits claim 1 by reciting the limitation that step (iii) conducted at a temperature of from about 1 degree C to about 10 degrees C. Claim 15 further limits claim 1 by reciting the limitation that the method further comprises one or more step of dissolving the isolated beta glucan in an aqueous solution, precipitating the beta glucan by adding between 10% to 20% (vol/vol) of the C₁-C₄ alcohol to the

Art Unit: 1651

aqueous solution, and isolating the beta glucan. Claim 16 recites a method of isolating beta glucan from a milled cereal grain or a milled part of the cereal grain, comprising: (i) extracting the milled cereal grain or milled part of a cereal grain with an alkaline solution having a pH of between about 9.25 to about 9.75 for a period of time of about 15 to about 45 minutes to produce an extract comprising at least about 0.4 weight % beta glucan; (ii) removing insoluble material and removing particulate material having a particle size of greater than about 0.2 microns from the extract to produce a purified extract comprising beta glucan having a particle size of less than 0.2 microns, wherein the step of removing particulate material comprises one or more steps of adding a flocculant, a coagulant or both a flocculant and a coagulant to said extract to coagulate particulate material having a particle size of greater than about 0.2 microns, and removing the coagulated material from the extract, enzymatically digesting starch material in said extract, and filtering out material having a particle size greater than about 0.2 microns from said extract by microfiltration with a cutoff of 0.2 microns to produce the purified extract comprising beta glucan having a particle size of less than 0.2 microns as a filtrate; (iii) adding about 10% to about 25% (w/w) of a C₁-C₄ alcohol to the purified extract to precipitate the beta glucan; and (iv) isolating the beta glucan. Claim 29 recites the method of claim 1 wherein about 15% to about 17% (vol/vol) of the C₁-C₄ alcohol is added to the purified extract in step (iii). Claims 30 and 31 recite the method of claim 16 wherein about 10 to about 20% (vol/vol), specifically about 15% to about 17% (vol/vol), of the C₁-C₄ alcohol is added to the purified extract in step (iii). Claim 32 recites the method of claim 1 wherein the milled cereal grain or milled part of

Art Unit: 1651

the cereal grain is extracted with an alkaline solution having a value of pH of about 9.25 to about 9.75. Claim 34 is identical to claim 1.

5. Bhatti teaches a method for extracting beta glucan (including beta (1-3) beta (1-4) glucan; col. 2, lines 40-43) from milled cereal grain (including cultivars of barley, oat, wheat, rye, corn, sorghum and millet; col. 2, lines 37-39; col. 3, lines 12-21) comprising extraction with an alkaline solution with a pH from 8-14, particularly pH 10-12 (note that a pH of 10 would include a pH of "about 9.75"; col. 3, lines 22-27), removing insoluble (particulate) material by centrifugation, dialysis or filtration (col. 3, lines 46-48), adding about 20% to about 90% alcohol (including the C₁ to C₄ alcohols methanol, ethanol, propanol and butanol; col. 3, line 63-col. 4, line 5), and isolating the beta-glucan (col. 4, lines 5-8). The extract produced by the initial extraction with an alkaline solution of Bhatti would inherently contain from at least about 0.04 to about 1.3% beta glucan, because Bhatti discloses the use of cereals and milled cereal grains as starting materials which comprise from about 6.6 to 13.4% beta glucan, and that about 63-95% of the beta glucans are extractable, therefore the starting materials contained from about 4.2-12.7% extractable beta glucans (63% of 6.6% is about 4.2%, and 95% of 13.4% is about 12.7%; Tables II and IV); the cereal to solvent ratios used range from 1:10 to 1:100, therefore the alkaline extracts would contain about 0.04-1.3% beta glucans (4.2% divided by 100 is about 0.04%, and 12.7% divided by 10 is about 1.3%; col. 3, lines 38-44); since the extract of Bhatti is produced by the methods claimed in the instant application, the extract produced by Bhatti would have inherently contained beta (1-3) beta (1-4) glucan within the claimed range. Bhatti teaches that the step of

removing particulate material can comprise the addition of a flocculant and/or coagulant to coagulate particulate material, which would have a particle size of greater than 0.2 microns (an acid is used as the coagulant/flocculant; col. 3, lines 48-54), removal of particulate material from the extract by centrifugation (col. 3, lines 52-54), digestion of starch material in the extract using an enzyme (col. 3, lines 53-56) and filtering out of particulate material from the extract (col. 3, lines 63-65). Bhatti teaches that the pH of the alkaline solution can be adjusted to about 7 (neutral) prior to enzymatic digestion (col. 3, lines 48-56). Bhatti teaches that step wherein the alcohol is added to the beta glucan extract can be conducted at 4 degrees C (Fig. 1, step 7). Bhatti teaches the further step of dissolving the beta glucan in an aqueous solution and precipitating again with alcohol and isolating the beta glucan by centrifugation (Fig. 1, step 9). The alkaline extraction step of Bhatti is generally carried out for between about 2 and about 25 hours (col. 3, lines 41-42). The reference does not teach that the step of extracting the beta glucan with alkaline solution is carried out for about 15 to about 45 minutes.

6. Potter teaches a method for extraction of beta glucan wherein the alkaline extraction step is carried out for about 0.5 to about 3 hours (abstract, col. 5, lines 13-18).

7. Jamas teaches a method for the extraction of beta glucan wherein soluble beta glucan can be separated from insoluble beta glucan by ultrafiltration (abstract, col. 6, lines 16-32). The reference teaches that filtration using a 0.2 micron filter is desirable because it is an acceptable method for sterilizing pharmaceutical products (col. 6, line 67-col. 7, line 2, col. 11, lines 48-51).

8. A method for the extraction of beta glucan using the claimed reaction conditions was known in the art at the time of the invention, as taught by Bhatti and discussed above. A method for extraction of beta glucan wherein the alkaline extraction step is carried out for about 0.5 to about 3 hours was also known in the art at the time of the invention, as taught by Potter. One would be motivated to combine the teachings of Bhatti and Potter because Potter discusses the need for efficient processes for extraction of beta glucan (col. 2, lines 23-27) and Bhatti teaches that the extraction time can vary (col. 3, lines 41-45). One skilled in the art would therefore have been motivated to reduce the time of the alkaline extraction step of the method for extraction of beta glucan taught by Bhatti to about 0.5 to about 3 hours, as taught by Potter in the course of routine experimentation. It was also known at the time of the art that filtration could be used to separate soluble beta glucan from insoluble beta glucan, as taught by Bhatti, Potter and Jamas; Potter teaches the use of a 0.2 micron filter for this purpose (col. 6, lines 26-32) and Jamas teaches the use of ultrafiltration and a 0.2 micron filter for subsequent sterilization. Because both Potter and Jamas teach that a 0.2 micron filter is appropriate for the filtration of a beta glucan solution, particularly for the separation of insoluble and soluble beta glucan, as disclosed by Bhatti and Potter, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a 0.2 micron filter in the filtration step of Bhatti. Further, although applicant recites in some of the dependent claims the use of up to about 17% alcohol to precipitate the purified extract, Bhatti teaches the use of "about 20%" alcohol to precipitate the purified extract; even if it is found that "about 20%" alcohol does not anticipate applicant's recitation of "about 17%"

Art Unit: 1651

alcohol, this amount have been arrived at by one of ordinary skill in the art in the course of routine experimentation, as evidenced by Bhatti's teaching that the amount of alcohol used to precipitate the purified extract can be varied (col. 4, lines 1-8). One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the teachings of Bhatti and Potter to develop a method for extraction of beta glucan using the claimed conditions with a shorter length of time for the alkaline extraction step because it was known in the art at the time of the invention that beta glucans could be extracted from milled cereal grain using an alkaline extraction step that is carried out for about 0.5 to about 3 hours, as taught by Potter. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings discussed above to arrive at a method for extraction of beta glucan using the claimed conditions.

9. Claims 1-9, 11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatti (US 5,518,710) in view of Potter et al. (US 6,323,338) and Jamas et al. (US 5,622,939) as applied to claims 1-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 above, and further in view of Puski et al. (US 4,830,861). Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 have been discussed above. Claims 7 and 8 recite the method claim 6 wherein, following the digestion of the starch material, the enzyme is inactivated, specifically by acidifying the neutralized solution.

10. The teachings of Bhatti, Potter and Jamas have been described above. As discussed above, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bhatti and Potter to arrive at a method for the extraction of beta glucan comprising nearly all of the

Art Unit: 1651

claimed elements. Neither of the references, however, teaches the inactivation of the enzyme, particularly inactivation using an acid.

11. Puski teaches the use of amylase for digestion of starch and inactivation of the enzyme using an acid (col. 16, lines 55-63).

12. As discussed above, a process for extraction of beta glucan from milled cereal grain comprising the nearly all of the claimed steps was known at the time of the invention, as taught by Bhatti, Potter and Jamas. It was also known in the art at the time of the invention that an enzyme (amylase) could be inactivated in a reaction mixture by acidifying the solution, as taught by Puski. The motivation to combine the teachings of Bhatti and Puski is taught by Puski, who teaches that the inactivation of amylase in a reaction mixture is desirable (col. 1, lines 55-63). One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the teachings discussed above by denaturing the enzyme in the reaction mixture for the extraction of beta glucan from milled cereal grain because Bhatti teaches that the reaction mixture could be acidified to a pH as low as 2 (col. 3, lines 48-52). Puski teaches that the use of a pH of 3.8 is sufficient to inactivate the amylase in the reaction mixture (col. 16, lines 61-62). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings discussed above to develop the claimed method for extraction of beta glucan.

13. Claim 1-6, 9-11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatti (US 5,518,710) in view of Potter et al. (US 6,323,338)

Art Unit: 1651

and Jamas et al. (US 5,622,939) as applied to claims 1-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 above, and further in view of Novozymes (June 1, 2002, novozymes.com). Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 have been discussed above. Claim 10 recites the method of claim 9, wherein the amylase does not require a calcium cofactor.

14. The teachings of Bhatt, Potter and Jamas have been described above. As discussed above, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bhatt and Potter to arrive at a method for the extraction of beta glucan comprising nearly all of the claimed elements. Neither of the references, however, teaches the use of an amylase that does not require a calcium cofactor.

15. Novozymes teaches an amylase, TERMAMYL ULTRA 300 L, that does not require a calcium cofactor (p. 1, paragraph 6).

16. A method for extraction of beta glucan using the claimed conditions comprising the addition of amylase to the reaction mixture was known in the art at the time of the invention, as discussed above. Further, an amylase that does not require the addition of a calcium cofactor was known in the art at the time of the invention, as taught by Novozymes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Bhatt and Novozymes because Bhatt discusses the use of TERMAMYL and the addition of calcium ions for the enhancement of the enzyme (col. 3, lines 60-62). Novozymes discusses an improvement to the TERMAMYL enzyme (TERMAMYL ULTRA 300 L) that makes it more stable in the absence of calcium ions, and that the addition of calcium ions is not always sufficient for maintaining the stability of the enzyme (p. 1, paragraphs 4 and 6). One skilled in the art would therefore have been

motivated to use the improved enzyme taught by Novozymes in a method for extraction of beta glucan which uses TERMAMYL. One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the use of an amylase that does not require the addition of a calcium cofactor with a method for the extraction of beta glucan using the claimed conditions because it was known in the art at the time of the invention that TERMAMYL was a compatible enzyme for use the extraction of beta glucan, as taught by Bhatt, and that the TERMAMYL ULTRA 300 L is an improvement of that enzyme with the same function. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings discussed above to arrive at the claimed invention.

17. Claim 1-6, 9-11, 14-16 and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatt (US 5,518,710) in view of Potter et al. (US 6,323,338) and Jamas et al. (US 5,622,939) as applied to claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 above, and further in view of Morgan (WO/2001/057092 A1). Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-16, 29-32 and 34 have been discussed above. Claims 28 and 33 recites the methods of claim 4 and 16, respectively, wherein the flocculant is selected from the group consisting of polyacrylamide, a quaternary acrylate salt and a natural flocculant macromolecule, and the coagulant is selected from the group consisting of alum, lime, ferric chloride, ferrous sulfate, an organic polymer and a synthetic polyelectrolyte with anionic or cationic functional groups.

18. The teachings of Bhatti, Potter and Jamas have been described above. As discussed above, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bhatti and Potter to arrive at a method for the extraction of beta glucan comprising nearly all of the claimed elements. Neither of the references, however, teaches the use of a flocculant and/or coagulant selected from the group recited in the claims.

19. Morgan teaches a method of the extraction of beta glucan wherein proteins are removed by adding a flocculant, such as carageenan, a natural flocculant molecule and an organic polymer (p. 5, lines 1-6).

20. A method for extraction of beta glucan comprising nearly all of the claimed elements was known in the art at the time of the invention, as discussed above. Further, it was known at the time of the invention that a flocculant, including the claimed flocculants, could be used to remove protein in a process for the extraction and purification of beta glucan, as taught by Morgan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these teachings because Potter discusses the need for forming a flocculant from proteins by heating or cooling for removal during purification of beta glucan (col. 5, lines 42-60). Morgan discusses an alternative method which comprises the addition of a flocculant. Thus, there existed in the prior art at the time of the invention a known alternative to the heating and cooling for removal of proteins taught by Potter, i.e. the use of a flocculant, as taught by Morgan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the use of a flocculant could have been applied to the combined method of Bhatti and Potter to yield predictable results, i.e. the flocculation of proteins from the beta glucan solution, as taught by Morgan. One

Art Unit: 1651

of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining these teachings because Morgan teaches that the use of a flocculant is suitable in similar process for the purification of beta glucan. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings discussed above to arrive at the claimed method.

21. Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments filed August 12, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach the new claim limitation that the step of removing particulate material includes using a single step of microfiltration to filter out particulate material having a particle size of greater than about 0.2 microns from the extract by microfiltration with a cutoff size of 0.2 microns to produce a purified extract comprising beta glucan having a particle size of less than 0.2 microns. However, the new grounds of rejection above provide motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a microfiltration with a cutoff size of 0.2 microns in the method of Bhatti. Briefly, it was known in the art at the time of the art that filtration could be used to separate soluble beta glucan from insoluble beta glucan, as taught by Bhatti, Potter and Jamas; Potter teaches the use of a 0.2 micron filter for this purpose (col. 6, lines 26-32) and Jamas teaches the use of ultrafiltration and a 0.2 micron filter

for sterilization. Because a filter with the cutoff size recited in the claims was known in the art at the time of the invention to be useful for the separation of insoluble and soluble beta glucan, as disclosed by Potter, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a 0.2 micron filter in the filtration step of Bhatti. Although applicant argues that the cited references do not teach a single filtration step, it is noted that the instant claims recite a process wherein the step of removing particulate material comprises filtering out material having the particle size recited in the claims by a single step of microfiltration; the claims do not preclude another filtration step for the removal of particles of another size. Single microfiltration steps for the removal of the particle size recited in the claims are taught by the cited prior art, for instance, in Jamas and in Potter (see Potter at p. 6, par. 51). The motivation to combine the teachings to arrive at the claimed method is discussed in the rejections above. Therefore, the cited references render obvious the claimed invention and applicant's argument has not been found to be persuasive.

23. Thus, applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they have not been found to be persuasive.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHERIDAN R. MACAULEY whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1651

(571)270-3056. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 7:30AM-5:00PM EST, alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SRM

/Ruth A. Davis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651